FILE COPY

Office-Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
OCT 22 1965
JOHN F. DAVIS, CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1965

PETITION NOT PRINTED No. 618 [redacted]

WINCKLER & SMITH CITRUS PRODUCTS CO., a corporation, and JAMES A. A. SMITH, as Trustee of Winckler & Smith Citrus Products Co., a corporation,

Petitioners,

vs.

SUNKIST GROWERS, INC., a corporation, and THE EXCHANGE ORANGE PRODUCTS COMPANY, a corporation,

Respondents.

Answering Brief in Opposition to Petitioners' Petition for a Writ of Certiorari.

Ross C. FISHER,
458 South Spring Street,
Los Angeles, Calif. 90013,

HERMAN F. SELVIN,
523 West Sixth Street,
Los Angeles, Calif. 90014,

Attorneys for Respondents.

Parker & Son, Inc., Law Printers, Los Angeles. Phone MA. 6-9171.

SUBJECT INDEX

Page

Counter statement of the case 2

Argument 13

I.

Certiorari will not lie to review either the stay order or the judgment of dismissal as they are each orders which the District Court had jurisdiction to make and may not be set aside in the absence of a finding of gross abuse of discretion 13

II.

In making the stay order and the judgment of dismissal of the action the District Court did not abuse its discretion 17

III.

Respondents' judgments for costs on appeal awarded by this Court and by the Court of Appeals were made in the exercise of their respective jurisdictions and have become final and should not be disturbed 24

Conclusion 28

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

Cases — Page

Bankers Securities Corp. v. Ritz Carlton Restaurant & Hotel Co., 99 F. 2d 51 14
Bartels v. Redfield, 47 Fed. 708 26
Berthold v. Burton, 169 Fed. 495 25
Boling v. United States, 231 F. 2d 926 15
Broffe v. Horton, 173 F. 2d 565 25
Carolene Products Co. v. Evaporated Milk Assn., 93 F. 2d 202 22
Columbia Motor Car Co. v. Duerr & Co., 184 Fed. 916 26
Commercial Banking Corp. v. Martel, 44 Fed. Supp. 792 14
De Filippis v. Chrysler Sales Corp., 116 F. 2d 375 15
Delno v. Market St. Ry. Co., 124 F. 2d 965 17
First National Bank v. Stansbury, 214 Cal. 190, 5 P. 2d 11 ..... 14, 25
General Talking Pictures Corp v. Western Electric Co., 304 U.S. 175 16
Henderson v. Griffin, 5 Peters (U.S.), 151, 8 L. Ed. 79 14
Hicks v. Bekins Moving & Storage Co., 115 F. 2d 406 ..... 16, 17
Houston Oil Company v. Goodrich, 245 U.S. 440 16
Isaacs v. De Hon, 11 F. 2d 943 23
Jennings v. Burton, 177 Fed. 603 25
Kimble v. Western Union Tel. Co., 99 Fed. 892 14
Land Oberoesterreich v. Gude, 93 F. 2d 292 ..24, 25, 26
Magnum Import Co. v. Coty, 262 U.S. 159 16
Maltz v. Sax, 134 F. 2d 2, cert. den., 319 U.S. 772 .. 22

Page

Meserve v. Superior Court, 2 Cal. App. 2d 468, 38 P. 2d 453 25

Miller v. Town of Suffield, 249 F. 2d 16 14

N.L.R.B. v. Pittsburgh S.S. Company, 340 U.S. 498 16

Northern Indiana Oil Co., In re, 192 F. 2d 142 26

Pacific Portland Cem. Co. v. Food Machinery & Chemical Corp., 178 F. 2d 541 22

Pacific S. Metal Works v. California Canneries Co., 164 Fed. 980 23

Proper v. John Bene & Sons, Inc., 299 Fed. 863 22

Russell v. Cunningham, 233 F. 2d 806 .....15, 16

Sebolt v. National Bank of New Jersey, 65 A. 2d 868 14

Shotkin v. Westinghouse Electric & Mfg. Co., 169 F. 2d 825 15

Sunkist Growers, Inc. et al. v. Winckler & Smith Citrus Products Co., et al., 284 F. 2d 1, reh. den., 289 F. 2d 933 3

Sunkist Growers, Inc. et al. v. Winckler & Smith Citrus Products Co., et al., 316 F. 2d 275 .....5, 26

Sunkist Growers, Inc. et al. v. Winckler & Smith Citrus Products Co., et al., 370 U.S. 19, 8 L. Ed. 2d 305, 28 S. Ct. 1130, reh. den., 370 U.S. 965, 8 L. Ed. 2d 834, 82 S. Ct. 1577 4

United States v. Copeland, 295 F. 2d 635, cert. den., 368 U.S. 955, 82 S. Ct. 398, 7 L. Ed. 2d 388 17

United States v. Pacific Fruit and Produce, 138 F. 2d 367 .....15, 16

Vaughn v. The First National Bank of Greenville, 218 F. 2d 804, cert. den., 100 L. Ed. 759 15

Page

Weidenfeld v. Pacific Improvement Co., 101 F. 2d 699 14

Weile v. Sturtevant, 176 Cal. 767, 169 Pac. 685 ..14, 15

Winckler & Smith Citrus Products Co. et al. v. Sunkist Growers, Inc. et al., 346 F. 2d 1012 .....12, 24

Winckler & Smith Citrus Products Co. et al. v. United States Court of Appeals et al., No. 314 Misc. Oct. Term 1964, 13 L. Ed. 2d Adv. Rep. p. 76 .....12, 27

Rules

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 41(b) ..8, 15, 17

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 52(a) 17

Rules of the Court of Appeals, Rule 38 8

Rules of the Supreme Court, Rule 19 13

Rules of the Supreme Court, Rule 57 24

Rules of the Supreme Court, Rule 57(2) 27

Statutes

United States Code Annotated, Title 28, Sec. 1254-(1) 13

United States Code Annotated, Title 28, Sec. 1292-(b) 8

Textbooks

14 American Jurisprudence, Sec. 90 14

14 American Jurisprudence, Suppl., Sec. 93 25

20 Corpus Juris Secundum, Sec. 426 14

20 Corpus Juris Secundum, Sec. 427 14

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1965
No. 618 Misc.

WINCKLER & SMITH CITRUS PRODUCTS CO., a corporation, and JAMES A. A. SMITH, as Trustee of Winckler & Smith Citrus Products Co., a corporation,

Petitioners,

vs.

SUNKIST GROWERS, INC., a corporation, and THE EXCHANGE ORANGE PRODUCTS COMPANY, a corporation,

Respondents.

Answering Brief in Opposition to Petitioners' Petition for a Writ of Certiorari.

Respondents were served with petitioners' motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of certiorari *in forma pauperis* and with petitioners' petition for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit filed concurrently therewith. Subsequently respondents received a copy of a letter from petitioners' counsel to the Clerk of this Court indicating that petitioners were paying the filing fee for the filing of the petition for a writ of certiorari and asking that their motion for leave to permit filing on typewritten papers should be in alternative to their motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*. Respondents do not object to permission being granted petitioners to file typewritten briefs rather than